Class in Colonial Aotearoa: An Alternative Historiography

JARED DAVIDSON

Abstract
The question of class in colonial Aotearoa has vexed past historians. Yet the historiography has often been foreshortened by narrow understandings of class-as-consciousness and sociological approaches that attempt to confine people into ever-expanding categories. Drawing on heterodox Marxist thought, this paper argues for a relational approach to class. A critique of the stratification approach is followed by a reading of class as a social relation of struggle, via the revolt of emigrant labourers in 1840s Nelson and rural incendiarism between 1865-1900. Viewing class as a relationship and process has the potential to reappraise key events in Aotearoa's past.

The question of class in colonial Aotearoa and whether we "have or have had a bourgeoisie and a proletariat, and a struggle between the two", has vexed historians across the decades.[1] When Bill Oliver asked after the bourgeoise and proletariat in 1969, he sparked a response by Erik Olssen and ongoing discussions in the *New Zealand Journal of History*.[2] There were further debates on class in the 1970s; John E. Martin published his exploration of nineteenth-century rural labour in 1983; and in the early 1990s there were a range of responses to Miles Fairburn's provocative book, *The Ideal Society and its Enemies*.[3] These historiographical-theoretical discussions may have seemed frustratingly narrow to some, but they usefully exposed the different understandings of class as applied to nineteenth century Aotearoa.

In his 2004 article, 'Class in Colonial New Zealand: Towards a Historiographical Rehabilitation', Jim McAloon summarised these discussions and the wider treatment of class in the historiography.[4] Apart from some notable exceptions, McAloon found that "most discussions approached class almost entirely in terms of class consciousness and emphasised the working class from 1890."[5] For McAloon, "there is more to class than consciousness", and "static portrayals which assume or imply a neat and fully-formed class structure that in turn gives rise to tidy and coherent expressions of consciousness" are unsatisfactory.[6] Highlighting approaches to class by Marxists such as Nicos Poulantzas, Erik Olin Wright, EP Thompson and Derek Sayer, McAloon convincingly showed how local approaches to class were mostly couched in terms of consciousness.

Since the publication of his article, McAloon and other historians have continued to employ class as a framework – even if some have baulked at the word class.[7] However, it has mainly been sociologists (and to a lesser extent, feminist geographers) who have taken up discussions of what class is. Take, for example, Christopher Wilkes' somewhat-overlooked publication *Reinventing Capitalism in New Zealand: History, Structure, Practice and Social Class* – one of the most thorough books to engage with class (and historians of class) in recent times.[8] In his 2011 thesis and subsequent articles, Patrick Ongley also surveys class using a sociological lens, highlighting its competing and complementary perspectives.[9] Recent publishing within political economy, such as Catherine Comyn's *The Financial Colonisation of Aotearoa*, and Matthew Scobie and Anna Sturman's BWB Text *The Economic Possibilities of Decolonisation*, employ political Marxist approaches to past and present class relations, drawing upon feminist, Indigenous and critical theory in refreshing ways.[10]

Journal of New Zealand Studies NS39 (2025), 93-94 https://doi.org/10.26686/jnzs.iNS39.9895

What follows is not an attempt to bring McAloon's survey of class in Aotearoa historiography up to date. Rather, I hope to put historians in dialogue with heterodox Marxist readings of class. This alternative historiography can be found among dissident, anti-authoritarian strands of Marxist thought that represent a return to Marx's critique of political economy – a critique shorn of the dogmatic and teleological baggage of the Second and Third Internationals.[11] As Frederick Harry Pitts notes, "contrary to approaches that prioritize historical materialism as kind of economic determinism, Marx's critique of political economy is not an argument for the 'primacy of the economic', but, rather, concerns the 'social production and reproduction of the life of society as a whole.'"[12] Class, in this reading, is much more than waged work, income differentials or consciousness.

The article is structured in the following way. First, I introduce the sociological approach to class that is so common in the historiography canvased by McAloon. I then share critiques of sociological and traditional Marxist approaches to class from within certain Marxian thought, including Ellen Meiksins Wood via EP Thompson, and open Marxism in particular. As these critiques show, it is possible to avoid the pitfalls of economic reductionism and the need for ever-expanding categories to account for the diverse realities of lived experience within capitalism. Class, in this framing, is mediated by other relations that form a dialectical totality, rather than class being one of many separate systems of domination that overlap (as posited by liberal thought, dual systems theory and intersectionality, for example). Finally, I provide brief examples from my own research into nineteenth-century class struggle: the revolt of emigrant labourers and their wives in 1840s Nelson, and rural incendiarism between 1865 and 1900. Viewing class as a *relationship* and *process* that takes place in historical time and specific contexts has informed my own historical practice, and I believe this offers historians of nineteenth century Aotearoa a fruitful analysis—one rooted in the exploration of everyday antagonisms and social reproduction.

That historians have questioned the value of class analysis in Aotearoa historiography is, in my view, due to a narrow understanding of what class is. So much of the historiography is plagued by a sociological approach to class. This approach is based on stratification and the need to confine people into categories: hence the focus on occupation, hierarchy, status, income differentials, social role, market location or class consciousness. Who is working class? Where does the middle class start and stop? Who were the gentry? Was there a gentry?

Rather than rehash McAloon's excellent survey, one prominent (and typical) example will suffice. This is the definition of class on *Te Ara, the Encyclopedia of New Zealand*. Here we find a typical stratification approach to class. According to the entry, "classes are major social groupings composed of people with similar levels of economic resources, property and status. They are traditionally defined as working class, middle class and upper class."[13] With its focus on stratification and categorisation, this framing denies the usefulness of a Marxist class analysis, arguing that Aotearoa had "several categories of worker who sat uncomfortably between Marx's bourgeoisie and working class."[14] In this view, a Marxist approach to class cannot explain "major markers of social difference" such as gender or the colonial relation, which "confuse class analysis."[15]

The entry is right—if we take a traditional Marxist and sociological approach to class. However, these approaches not only miss what class is, they tell us little about lived social relations and the qualitative antagonisms within them.

Journal of New Zealand Studies NS39 (2025), 93-94 https://doi.org/10.26686/jnzs.iNS39.9895

Ellen Meiksins Wood critiques the traditional Marxist and sociological approach in her exploration of class in the work of EP Thompson. In particular, she took aim at sociological definitions of class and how stratification renders class invisible. "Where is the dividing line between classes in a continuum of inequality?" she asks. "Where is the qualitative break in a structure of stratification?"[16] First developed in her article 'The Politics of Theory and the Concept of Class,' and later reworked as two chapters in her book *Democracy Against Capitalism*, Wood shows how Thompson placed class struggle at the centre of his theory and historical practice; how class struggle precedes class; and how class is a relationship and a process. For Wood, stratification theories that focus on things like income, occupation or other criteria account for "*differences*, *inequalities*, and *hierarchy*, not *relations* [emphasis in the original]."[17]

Wood was working in the political Marxist tradition, which emphasises historical specificity. Others have drawn on the notion of composition within autonomist Marxism to show the importance of class as a process. For example, David Camfield expands on Wood and Thompson in his article, 'Re-Orienting Class Analysis: Working Classes as Historical Formations'.[18] For Camfield, the sociology of class has led to "unproductive debates about where to place particular occupations and where to draw boundaries between classes."[19] In turn, the rich totality of social relations and their antagonisms are lost. That is because class exists as a social activity between people, rather than as a "thing", a "structure" or a "location." As Thompson himself wrote in 'The Peculiarities of the English':

> Sociologists who have stopped the time-machine and, with a good deal of conceptual huffing and puffing, have gone down to the engine-room to look, tell us that nowhere at all have they been able to locate and classify a class… of course they are right, since class is not this or that part of the machine, but the way the machine works once it is set in motion… Class is a social and cultural formation (often finding institutional expression) which cannot be defined abstractly, or in isolation, but only in terms of relationships.[20]

While not explicitly Marxist, class as a relationship and process also features in structured action theory. Following Raewyn Connell, James Messerschmidt has explored gender, race and class as internal relations that mutually constitute one another. These are expressed in social interaction: in other words, as a practice between people. For Messerschmidt, we "do" gender, race and class in situational ways. Class is not a thing but an activity, a verb rather than a noun. "The capacity to exercise power is, for the most part, a reflection of one's position in social relationships."[21]

As these relational approaches to class suggest, not everyone can fit into a tidy categorical box – let alone stay there over time and across different situations and contexts. Focused on fitting individuals into catch-all groups, sociological approaches to class (in their Marxist and Weberian forms) resort to more and more "boxes" to make sense of the many ways capitalist social relations are experienced historically. In doing so, they not only contradict their very purpose, they are ultimately guilty of the reductionism described in *Te Ara*'s entry on class.[22] Stratification approaches to class also blunt the powerful insights of Marx's critique of political economy as a critical social theory.

Journal of New Zealand Studies NS39 (2025), 93-94 https://doi.org/10.26686/jnzs.iNS39.9895

Richard Gunn made this point in his 1987 essay, 'Notes on Class'.[23] Grounded in the open Marxist milieu, his analysis is a refreshing rebuttal of orthodox Marxism and its departure from the critical insights of Marx. "It is much easier to say what, according to Marxism, class is not than to say what class is," writes Gunn. "A class is not a group of individuals, specified by what they have in common (their income level or life-style, their 'source of revenue', their relation to the means of production, etc.)."[24] Class, like capital itself, is a social relation:

> That which is a relation cannot be a group, even a relationally specified group; nor can it be a position or place (a relationally specified place) in which a group may be constituted, or may stand. Setting aside such views, we can say that class is the relation itself (for example, the capital-labour relation) and, more specifically, a relation of struggle. The terms 'class' and 'class relation' are interchangeable, and 'a' class is a class-relation of some historically particular kind.[25]

For Gunn, classes are not pre-given entities that enter into struggle with one another, but rather class struggle is the fundamental premise of class. As such, class struggle can take many forms – overt, covert, collective, individual, the everyday, the extraordinary – because the class relation can structure "the lives of different individuals in different ways."[26] A focus on class as a relation "allows the line of class division to fall through, and not merely between, the individuals concerned," avoiding reductionism and bringing "the experiential richness of individuals' (self-)contradictory life-texture into full theoretical and phenomenological light."[27] Understanding class as a relation of struggle means that "all aspects of individual existence—and not for example merely the economic aspect—are class-relevant and class concerned."[28] This conception of class ("the point of view of totality") rejects "the narrowness of the conception of politics which the sociological conception of class entails."[29]

When class is understood "in its authentically Marxist sense"—as a social relation of struggle, mediated by different yet internally-contained relations such as gender and race—the charge of reductionism is misplaced.[30] In fact, it is sociologists and orthodox Marxists that want to "situate each individual, unequivocally and without remainder, in one or other of the specified groups or places"—the "pure" capitalist class or proletariat.[31] The proliferation of "middle classes, middle strata, new petty bourgeoisie etc. is to find some pigeon-hole to which each individual may be unequivocally assigned."[32] The ways in which individuals are divided in and against themselves enters theoretical eclipse. As Tom Houseman writes, by conceptualising class as identifiable groups aimed at subsuming every member of a society under a classificatory schema, "the capital-labour relation quickly degenerates into an ever-more fragmented taxonomy of different groups, strata and sub-class fractions."[33] Instead, Houseman suggests that:

> a single class relation (capital-labour) appears as a multitude of positions, including but not limited to capitalists and workers. Managers, self-employed entrepreneurs, shop-owners, retirees, housewives, prisoners, the disabled and many more: all confront their social world and the problem of subsistence as different configurations of the capital-labour relation, but where this relation 'cuts through' them rather than each inhabiting one side or the other.[34]

Journal of New Zealand Studies NS39 (2025), 93-94 https://doi.org/10.26686/jnzs.iNS39.9895

In this approach, class is mediated through other social relations such as gender, sexuality and race. Counter to dual systems theory and intersectionality – which suggests that separate systems of domination intersect – it is more useful to treat social relations such as gender, race and class as a unity of lived experience: as a totality. As Joshua Clover and Nikhil Singh argue, "it is trivial unto meaninglessness to treat one without the other."[35] This does not mean collapsing gender or colonial relations into class but seeing them as co-constitutive. Class is never only about class, writes Camfield. Class presupposes gender just as gender presupposes class.

It is in this sense that workers of different stripes can share affinities, sympathies—class consciousness, even—but the capital-labour relation means in historically specific contexts workers experience opposing or differing interests. For Werner Bonefeld, class is a living contradiction. The existence of a class in a sociological sense "by no means translates into equality of interests and action", because "class society is a contradictory reality."[36] Class, in his view, "is a category of a perverse form of social objectification" that "denotes a social relationship that is independent from individuals while prevailing only in and through them."[37]

Others have framed the contradictions of the capital-labour relation in terms of divisions of labour. Iris Young called for substituting the category of class with division of labour, arguing that it better revealed cleavages and contradictions within a class, the activity of labour itself and the specific social and institutional relations of that activity.[38] Young was responding to the narrow use of class by the traditional left, one that focused on a person's (read: male) class in relation to waged production, while ignoring the gendered relations of unwaged work and those people outside of the formal wage. Whether framed as divisions of labour or mediated relations within a totality, this relational approach recognises the lived experience of historical actors and the multiple fault lines that fall between *and* through them.

That the capital-labour relation is mediated through multiple relations also recognises that within the classical workers' movement, class was always a narrow and abstract identity. The supposedly universal "collective worker" promoted by the workers' movement was always a particular class identity. This identity "subsumed workers only insofar as they were stamped, or were willing to be stamped, with a very particular character" – overwhelmingly male, industrial-based, semi-skilled waged workers who "conformed to a certain image of respectability, dignity, hard work, family, organisation, sobriety, atheism, and so on."[39] The reality was much more diverse and heterogenous, both in terms of the work people did and the identities they chose to affirm – even as their lives were shaped and reproduced within the capital-labour relation. This is especially true in terms of rural nineteenth century Aotearoa. Again, class consciousness (and the spectre of its opposite, that of "false consciousness") cannot be the sole indicator of class.

Thess approaches to class have shaped my recent work on prison labour, and especially *The History of a Riot*, my research into the revolt of emigrant labourers and their wives in 1840s Nelson.[40] My understanding of their struggle against the New Zealand Company (and at times, against each other) was based on viewing class as a relationship and a process. For example, in that text I attempted to describe people's relationship to the wage rather than their occupation. For as Jacques Rancière notes, occupational terms like "artisan" suggest a "certain identification of an individual with a function. Yet identities are often misleading… the same individual can be found self-employed in one trade, salaried in another, or hired as a clerk or peddler in a third."[41] While occupation was useful in terms of basic categorisation, it could not account for the shifting situation that the emigrant labourers and their families faced, nor the ways in which they reproduced themselves: whether through relief work, making shift, or theft.

The framework of occupation also fell short when faced with the class composition (and decomposition) of the gang-men's power in the face of Company officials. In Nelson, certain types of work on and off the relief gangs (mediated by gender and not necessarily aligned with occupation) constituted one division of labour. Other divisions were religious beliefs, the work ethic and politics of respectability, and importantly, the access to or desire for land. Company officials exploited such divisions – between those they labelled the "indolent" and "industrious", the "independent" and "loafers." It was piecework schemes and the allotment of land that, in the end, "judiciously destroyed the combination [of the gang-men]… by a distribution of gratuitous support for those men cultivating land on their own account."[42] Those with no desire for land or to perform piecework were targeted and gradually isolated from the rest of the gang-men. The layoffs and reductions in pay that, only months before, had caused rioting and work stoppages, were implemented with little resistance.

The complexities of the class relation is also evident in the little-studied phenomenon of rural incendiarism in colonial Aotearoa. Through a close reading of the *New Zealand Police Gazette*, newspaper reports, station diaries and court records between 1865 and 1900, to date I have found over 400 cases of stack burning – the deliberate arson of harvested crops such as wheat, oats, and barley. The intentional burning of property in this way has the potential to complicate our understanding of rural class relations. It also calls into question what constitutes class struggle in colonial Aotearoa. By reframing the wheat boom of the 1870s-1900s as a socioecological frontier of capital accumulation – "a product of political economy" that entails "people in production relationships of authority and subordination, indeed relations of class" – the burning of stacks become much more than just individual discontent.[43]

The phenomenon of stack burning post-harvest was common knowledge in wheat producing areas such as Canterbury, Otago, and Southland. "The period of tribulation for insurance companies and stack owners has commenced" warned the *North Otago Times* in February 1881; indeed, as autumn dawned, the *Otago Daily Times* reminded its readers that now the "crops have been gathered in, the usual cases of incendiarism begin to make their appearance."[44] In the 1870s stack burning was "almost epidemic", leading to calls for a united front "of farmers and others interested to protect themselves from the incendiarism which prevails."[45] In April 1874, one editor counted three fires within the Lakes District and "no less than five stack fires recorded as occurring in various parts of Otago, outside this district, all between the 3rd and 11th instant."[46]

Journal of New Zealand Studies NS39 (2025), 93-94 https://doi.org/10.26686/jnzs.iNS39.9895

Tramps and swaggers were convenient scapegoats, but the cause of the fires was often closer to home – a farmer's own employees. When Thomas Smith was brought before the magistrate's court in June 1878 for setting fire to his employer's stack, it transpired that a disagreement around his terms of employment had preceded the fire.[47] A wage dispute led to the arson of three stacks of oats in Waiwera, while in Ellesmere a former farmhand was accused of setting fire to a stack of wheat after his dismissal.[48] George Jones was accused of burning a stack of oats belonging to Arthur Calder, who had refused to employ Jones on his farm at Lovell's Flat, Otago.[49] At Meadow Bank Farm near Kirwee, two stacks of wheat and a threshing machine were torched around midnight on 10 March 1882. Suspicion was attached "to Charles Webb, who was working at the threshing of the corn, was dissatisfied with his employment, and demanded his wages several times."[50] Employment dispute and indigenous resistance combined in one exceptional case in Taranaki, when a Māori woman named Makarita fired two stacks on land leased from Māori by Arthur Bayly. Makarita wanted wages for harvesting work initially denied to her by Bayly, claiming in both te reo Māori and English that he "was a thief for not paying her more wages."[51] Makarita was found guilty and sentenced to three years penal servitude.[52]

Writing about rural arson in nineteenth century England, Mike Reed notes that historians have overlooked agrarian class conflict as "they tend to be looking for institutional forms that conform both to those developed by urban workers, and also to their own preconceptions of what forms are appropriate to workers in capitalist social formations."[53] While more research on rural arson in Aotearoa is needed before such claims can be made, the infrapolitics of incendiarism suggest a shadowy realm of class conflict and social antagonism that has been overlooked by Aotearoa historians. Again, the absence of overt class consciousness does not negate the existence of class and its antagonisms, as expressed in arson.

To return to the question of whether New Zealanders have or have had a bourgeoisie and a proletariat and a struggle between the two, the answer is clearly yes, but not in the way certain historians suggest. Understanding class as a social relationship begs a different set of questions—including the question I raised in *The History of a Riot*. How did class composition and class conflict, both overt and covert, play out in other colonial contexts? An understanding of class as a relationship and a process, and the expanded terrain of class struggle that comes with it, has the potential to unearth or reappraise key events and narratives in Aotearoa's past.

---

[1] W.H. Oliver, 'Rees, Sinclair and the Social Pattern,' in *The Feel of Truth: Essays in New Zealand and Pacific History*, ed. Peter Munz (Wellington: A.H. Reed, 1969), 163.
[2] Erik Olssen, 'The "Working Class" in New Zealand', *New Zealand Journal of History* 8:1 (1974).
[3] John E. Martin, 'Whither the Rural Working Class in Nineteenth-Century New Zealand?', *New Zealand Journal of History* 17:1 (1983); Miles Fairburn, *The Ideal Society and its Enemies: The Foundations of Modern New Zealand Society 1850–1900,* (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1989).
[4] Jim McAloon, 'Class in Colonial New Zealand: Towards a Historiographical Rehabilitation', *New Zealand Journal of History* 38:1 (2004).
[5] McAloon, 'Class in Colonial New Zealand', 1.
[6] McAloon, 'Class in Colonial New Zealand', 1.

Journal of New Zealand Studies NS39 (2025), 93-94 https://doi.org/10.26686/jnzs.iNS39.9895

[7] See, for example, David Haines and Jonathan West, 'Crew Cultures in the Tasman World' in *New Zealand and the Sea: Historical Perspectives*, ed. Francis Steele (Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 2018).
[8] Christopher Wilkes, *Reinventing Capitalism in New Zealand: History, Structure, Practice and Social Class* (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars, 2019).
[9] Patrick Ongley, 'Reshaping the Division of Labour: Work and Class in New Zealand Since the 1980s' (PhD Thesis, Te Herenga Waka-Victoria University of Wellington, 2011); Patrick Ongley, 'Class in New Zealand: Past, Present and Future', *Counterfutures* 1 (2016).
[10] Catherine Comyn, *The Financial Colonisation of Aotearoa* (Auckland: ESRA, 2023); Matthew Scobie and Anna Sturman, *The Economic Possibilities of Decolonisation* (Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 2024).
[11] These include autonomist Marxism, open Marxism, value theory, the "new reading of Marx", communisation theory, and the critique of political economy as a critical theory of society associated with the Frankfurt School.
[12] Frederick Harry Pitts, *Value* (Cambridge: Polity, 2021).
[13] Jock Phillips, 'Class', Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand, available at http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en/class
[14] Phillips, 'Class'.
[15] Phillips, 'Class'.
[16] Ellen Meiksins Wood, 'The Politics of Theory and the Concept of Class', *Studies in Political Economy* 9:1 (1982), 60.
[17] Wood, 'The Politics of Theory and the Concept of Class', 59.
[18] David Camfield, 'Re-orienting Class Analysis: Working Classes as Historical Formations', *Science and Society* 68:4 (2004–2005).
[19] Camfield, 'Re-orienting Class Analysis', 423.
[20] EP Thompson, 'The Peculiarities of the English', *Socialist Register* 2 (1965), 357.
[21] James Messerschmidt, *Crime as Structured Action: Gender, Race, Class, and Crime in the Making* (California: SAGE Publications, 1997), 9.
[22] As Werner Bonefeld notes, "'classification' contradicts its very purpose: clarification is sought by classifying the social relations into distinctive segments with the result that social categories proliferate to such an extent that the classificatory project finishes up with an unmanageable number of definitions. Instead of clarity, definitions encourage, in the name of accuracy (!), an infinite number of categories. This in turn leads to the creation of more general classifications, such as the level or basis of income, to provide clarity where 'accuracy' failed." Bonefeld, *Critical Theory and the Critique of Political Economy: On Subversion and Critical Reason* (New York: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2014), 103.
[23] Richard Gunn, 'Notes on Class', *Common Sense* 2 (1987).
[24] Gunn, 'Notes on Class', 15.
[25] Gunn, 'Notes on Class', 15.
[26] Gunn, 'Notes on Class', 17.
[27] Gunn, 'Notes on Class', 19.
[28] Gunn, 'Notes on Class', 22.
[29] Gunn, 'Notes on Class', 23.

[30] Gunn, 'Notes on Class', 19. Werner Bonefeld, citing Marx, notes that the term "mediation" is form-constitutive: "mediation 'is generally the way in which real contradictions are reconciled', allowing antagonistic relations 'to exist side by side' without sweeping away the antagonism… mediation thus gives 'social form' to antagonistic relations and these do not exist external to these forms but constitute and subsist in and through them." Bonefeld, 'On Postone's Courageous but Unsuccessful Attempt to Banish the Class Antagonism from the Critique of Political Economy', *Historical Materialism* 12:3 (2004), 114. For Frederick Pitts, mediation "constitutes the relation between things via another 'intermediate' thing, in the same way as 'a rope linking two climbers is constitutive of the relation in which they stand.'' Pitts, *Value*.
[31] Gunn, 'Notes on Class', 19.
[32] Gunn, 'Notes on Class', 19.
[33] Tom Houseman, 'Social Constitution and Class' in The SAGE Handbook of Frankfurt School Critical Theory, eds. Beverley Best, Werner Bonefeld and Chris O'Kane (London: SAGE Publications, 2018), 702.
[34] Houseman, 'Social Constitution and Class', 703.
[35] Joshua Clover and Nikhil Pal Singh, 'The Blindspot Revisited', blog, Verso, 12 October 2018, https://www.versobooks.com/blogs/4079-the-blindspot-revisited (accessed September 2019).
[36] Houseman, 'Social Constitution and Class', 705.
[37] Bonefeld, *Critical Theory and the Critique of Political Economy*, 102.
[38] Iris Young, 'Beyond the Unhappy Marriage: A Critique of Dual Systems Theory', cited by Kathi Weeks, *The Problem with Work: Feminism, Marxism, Antiwork Politics, and Postwork Imaginaries* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2011), 17.
[39] Endnotes, 'A History of Separation', available online at https://endnotes.org.uk/articles/the-infrastructure-of-the-modern-world
[40] Jared Davidson, *The History of a Riot* (Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 2021).
[41] Jacques Rancière, 'The Myth of the Artisan', *International Labor and Working Class History* 24 (1983), 1.
[42] W. Wakefield, *Report of the Directors of the New Zealand Company – 12th Report – Appendix H*, P ATL NZ 325.341, Alexander Turnbull Library, 106.
[43] Mick Reed, 'Class and Conflict in Rural England: Some Reflections on a Debate' in *Class, Conflict and Protest in the English Countryside, 1700-1880*, eds. Mick Reed and Roger Wells (London: Routledge, 1990), 10. As Matt Ryan (following Jason Moore) notes, the socioecological relations of capitalism exist through frontiers: "an understanding of the frontier is not mere prehistory to the establishment of 'pure' capitalist relations, but rather is instructive of the forces that constitute and drive capitalism." Matt Ryan, ''Our land abounds in nature's gifts': Commodity frontiers, Australian capitalism, and socioecological crisis' (PhD Thesis: University of Sydney, 2023), 145.
[44] *North Otago Times*, 26 February 1881; *Otago Daily Times*, 20 April 1869.
[45] *Timaru Herald*, 22 April 1872; *Lake Wakatip Mail*, 1 May 1874.
[46] *Lake County Press*, 24 April 1874.
[47] *North Otago Times*, 4 June 1878.
[48] *Otago Daily Times*, 18 April 1896; *Star*, 1 June 1896.
[49] *Bruce Herald*, 5 February 1875.
[50] *New Zealand Police Gazette*, 5 April 1882.
[51] *Taranaki Herald*, 20 April 1878.
[52] *Taranaki Herald*, 9 May 1878.
[53] Reed, 'Social Change and Social Conflict in Nineteenth Century England', 147.

Journal of New Zealand Studies NS39 (2025), 93-94 https://doi.org/10.26686/jnzs.iNS39.9895